THE HERALD OF SALVATION.

EDITED BY THE REV. PITT MORSE.

"Glory to God in the highest, and on earth peace, good will towards men." St. Luke, 2. 14.

"How beautiful are the feet of him that publisheth salvation!" Isa. 52. 7.

VOL. I. SATURDAY, APRIL 5, 1823. NO. 10.

CONTROVERSIAL.

Continued from page 68.

From the Niagara Journal of August 29th, 1820.

MR. EDITOR—I might have misunderstood *Benevolus*, but I really thought that in his first communication in the Patriot, he intended an 'attack' upon every thing that was not Universalism, in the religious community, and this I still believe would be the impression of any one, on reading it. There might have been a little appearance of severity in the note I handed you, but Benevolus does not appear to have profited much by it. I cannot well blame him, with the cause he has undertaken, for endeavoring to enlist a little public sympathy in his favor; moreover, it is common for wordy polemics to complain, if they chance in any degree to receive the treatment they give.—No; I have no desire to speak worse of the natural heart, or of the corrupt affections and lusts of men, than the Saviour or the apostles have, before me. But what shall we think of the religious tenets of that man, who can say, "He that reproaches the natural heart—reproaches nature's God?" The cloven foot was almost visible here, that there is no such thing as sin, or guilt, or deserved punishment, in the universe.

I know that if sinners "neglect so great salvation, they shall not escape:" but the final condemnation of one in sin, is not in itself what I take pleasure in, as Benevolus would insinuate. No: I never contemplate that event, without the same kind of feeling that I have when seeing the murderer suspended under the gallows. I do not regret the execution of the law, for this I know to be necessary; but I lament his wickedness and folly. With the Saviour, as he wept over Jerusalem, I am ready to say, "Oh that thou hadst known the things that belong to thy peace, but now they are hid from thine eyes." And I would, by all the motives with which God's word is charged—both by the "terror" and the mercy of God, desire that men may be persuaded to turn from their wicked ways and live.—— Much less would I cry peace, where God hath said there is no peace; well knowing that this was the course that Satan once took with our first parents, saying, as he offered the forbidden fruit, "Ye shall not surely die:" and well believing that this is the course most pleasing to him now, as one every way most successful to the building up of his kingdom. Benevolus would appear before his readers, as a man of great candor and fairness; as proofs of this, notice the following instances. Speaking of 'TRUTH,' he says, "He has raised an objection against '*the restitutioa of all things*,' in the following manner," &c. The words in Italics, Benevolus has quoted from *Acts* iii. 21, as containing a scripture sentiment, and proving universal salvation. The sentence in which these words are found, is this, "And he (God) shall send Jesus Christ, which before was preached unto you, whom the heavens must receive till the times of the restitution of all things, which God hath spoken by the mouth of all his holy prophets since the world began." Now, Benevolus has not told us what things those were of which the prophets spoke, as to be restored. No; instead of this, he has left entirely out the limiting clause; has stopped short at the words "*all things*," and thus contrived to turn them into an unlimited declaration, that all things whatever were to be restored; which, he further expects us to understand, means, that all men will be saved. Was this "wresting of scripture" intentional, must we suppose? or had Benevolus such eyes that he could read no farther than he has quoted? The apostle is here speaking of the time when the Jews, as a people, shall receive Messiah, of "the restoration of the kingdom to Israel," and their prosperity and glory under the reign of Messiah in the millenium; things of which all the prophets spake with one consent. But, whatever this passage means, to the plain man, Benevolus has a crucible that will get Universalism out of it.

But again, Benevolus quotes the passage which says, all sins shall be forgiven unto the sons of men, and blasphemies, wherewith soever they shall blaspheme; and then triumphantly asks, whether "any will be unforgiven." But here, too, he has left off in the middle of the sentence, and drawn out a meaning which makes our Lord contradict himself, and that in positive terms, in the same breath: a meaning that convicts Christ

of making a declaration and contradicting it in the same sentence. The whole passage reads thus: "Verily, I say unto you, all sins shall be forgiven unto the sons of men, and blasphemies wherewith soever they shall blaspheme; but he that shall blaspheme against the Holy Ghost, hath never forgiveness: (or, as it is in Matthew,) it shall never be forgiven him, neither in this world, neither in the world to come" If Benevolus had been better acquainted with the original language of the New Testament, he would have known that that language, being without the potential mode of the verb, expresses the present tense of that mode by the future of the indicative: and that the import of our Lord's declaration, in the general proposition here stated, and the limitation given, was, that the one was a case in which forgiveness could be extended, and the other a case in which it could not. In the one case, God had not interdicted forgiveness, and in the other he had; and that, while all other sins lay within the precincts to which pardon could extend, that in the text was one that he never would forgive. But Benevolus, if he can but extort Universalism out of a passage, seems quite regardless of consequences, in other respects. The passages he quotes to prove it, must be broken from their connection; the scope of the paragraphs which contain them must be lost sight of, and the design of the writers be forgotten, before they can be made in any way to favor the notions of the Universalists.—Take, for instance, *Rev.* xxi. 4, 5, as it is the first that I turn to, and look along down as far as the 7th and 8th verses. John is speaking of the blessed state of the saints in the heavenly world, after passing through the tribulations of this, and then says, "But the fearful, and unbelieving, and abominable," &c. "shall have *their* part in the lake," &c. "which is the second death."

As to the questions of Benevolus, it would be sufficient to answer them when their turn comes. One point at a time; and I have by no means done with the passage at the head of my first article, or with the pitiful commentary of Benevolus upon it. It is ever the effort of error to keep upon the wing; ever shifting, equivocal and evanescent, that it may elude the grasp of deliberate investigation. It is, however, indifferent with me, whether I answer him now or at another time.

As to the first, respecting the infinity of sin, I have ever preferred to associate the term *infinite* with the perfections and being of Jehovah. But why need Benevolus play upon the precise meaning of the word *infinite?* That the sinner cannot be recovered to the approbation of God and to heaven, on ground of law or distributive justice to him, is evident from this, that the wisdom of God has found out no way but that of *forgiveness* through faith in a Redeemer, and also from this practical truth, that the longer the sinner remains in impenitence, the more guilt he accumulates, and the deeper he falls under the condemnation of God's righteous law. The hoary headed sinner is deeper involved in sin and guilt than the child; and there is little reason to hope that "the fearful, and unbelieving, and the abominable," &c. in the future world, when restraining grace will be taken away, and they will become the companions of devils, will increase in wickedness in a less rapid ratio than in this life. If they can ever be taken to heaven on the ground of distributive justice, they can, with most propriety, on their first admission to punishment, and with yet more propriety while in this life; and so there is now, on this ground, no need of a gospel of *forgiveness*, in order to save men; they may go to heaven without pardon—There is no need of the atoning blood of Jesus; no need of grace, and no propriety in the song of the Redeemed, "Worthy is the Lamb that was slain, and has redeemed us to God by *his blood*," &c. &c.

Benevolus asks, "If the justice of God demand the endless punishment of the sinner, can justice ever possibly obtain its demands?" Just so might I ask, If the promise of God to believers is eternal life, how can he possibly perform his promise? God cannot give them eternal life, because they will be eternally receiving it. Pray, why will not Benevolus consider a little before he asks his questions? There are so many overshots of this kind in his piece, that it seems almost needless to answer them.

In his 3d and 4th questions, Benevolus seems to leave wholly out of view the moral nature of the divine government; the moral freedom and accountability of man, and treats sin as a calamity or disease merely, as though it were a fever or a broken leg; and looks upon the punishment of the transgressor, as upon the unmerited sufferings of an innocent being. To charge it upon God, if the sinner persist in sin till the penalty of the law overtakes him, as is insinuatingly done in the 3d question, is to charge God rashly. The scriptures speak a very different language. The law, the government, and the providence of God are good; and the means he is using to reclaim sinners from sin to himself, are all that can be asked; and I answer freely, if sinners persist, their blood be upon their own heads. God is just and glorious; while they "go away into ever-

asting punishment, prepared for the devil and his angels," as the scriptures declare.

Benevolus inquires to this effect, "Admitting that God has the will, the power, and the means, for the salvation of all men, what shall prevent it?" So I inquire, admitting that God had the will, and the power, and the means, why was not the world of the ungodly saved from the deluge of old, as well as Noah and his family? why did fire come down from heaven and destroy the inhabitants of Sodom? why did the earth open and swallow up Korah and his company? and why did fire "go out from the Lord and consume Nadab and Abihu?" God's will was, in *this*, in no sense in which it is not in the infliction of punishment in any case whatever, even up to the penalty of the law; and he had equal power and means to prevent it. But this is matter of fact. God did bring a deluge upon the old world, and rain down fire and destroy the inhabitants of Sodom, &c. I freely acknowledge that judgment is God's strange work: but, nevertheless, he will do it; and I believe as fully the denunciations as the promises of his word, in their plain and obvious import: and I pity the man who will blind his eyes to this truth. But does Benevolus attach any guilt to sin? any desert of punishment to the sinner? Yea, perhaps he may recollect to have recently, in serious conversation, stated that he flatly denied the doctrine of depravity; that of the trinity, and that of Christ's atonement; and if so, what is there left? You may call him Deist, Mahomedan, or any thing, provided you do not call him Christian. Does Benevolus hold at all to the doctrine of future punishment? If so, will the future punishment of the wicked be temporary or eternal? One it must be. If temporary, on what ground will they be released? by forgiveness? If so, then they might in justice not be released, or grace is no more grace. If they are released because they have endured the whole demands of justice, then they may go to heaven without grace and forgiveness, and there will be some in heaven who are not brought there by the grace of God in Christ; of which thing his word says nothing, except directly to contradict it, *Acts*, iv. 12.

But, I turn to the answers which Benevolus has given to the queries I raised on the words of our Lord, *Mark*, iii. 29, "But he that shall blaspheme against the Holy Ghost, hath never forgiveness, but is in danger of eternal damnation." He admits that the sin here adverted to, might be committed, and of course, that a case might occur in which the sinner would never receive forgiveness, and by consequence, (as there is no way to heaven but by forgiveness,) would never be saved. Again, he admits that there is such a thing as "eternal damnation;" but by a strange effort of criticism would have us understand, that this is only a temporary one. The first work of the apostles of error, is, to confound the meaning of terms; break up the established uses of language, and strive to distract the authorised signs of idea; and then, from this chaos, institute upon words a sense to suit their purpose. Any one acquainted with the original language of the New-Testament, knows very well, that "*aei-on*" signifies *always-being*, *always-existing*, and is as steadily appropriated to this sense, as any word in the English language is to the sense given it.—Even in all the New Testament, where this word, in the adjective form, as in the passage above cited, occurs 71 times, but three places only can be found where it is not rendered by one of the synonims, ever, everlasting, eternal: and in these three places it is, if I do not mistake, rendered world, by reason of the perpetuity of the world in comparison with the passing generations of men upon it; borrowing, in these places, all its force, and finding the reason of its use in them, from its own proper and literary meaning; as it also does in those places cited by Benevolus from the Old Testament.—But, will Benevolus inform us how long an "*eternal*" duration is? whether there is any such thing as a proper eternity revealed in the New-Testament; and if so, in what form is it expressed? By what word in the original language of the New-Testament, would he express a proper eternity, if not in the one rendered eternal in the passage referred to? That is habitually, if not uniformly, used to express the eternal life of the righteous, and point out the duration of that existence which is after the death of the body; and one may just as well undertake to prove that endless does not mean never-ending, as that eternal does not, or the word rendered eternal, in the passage cited. I know that Benevolus would not take the course which here he has; hoist into notice the "Improved Version," or, which is the same thing, make a new bible for himself, if he was not compelled to, or give up his scheme; but, in the name of common sense, let him be advised to resort to some more substantial ground of argument, if he has it, or throw away all pretensions to the belief or patience of his readers. But our Lord, in the passage, defines for himself the meaning of the word eternal, and makes the sense doubly strong; first negatively and then positively describing its proper eternity. "But he that shall blaspheme,"

&c. "hath *never* forgiveness;" or, as it is in the parallel place in Matthew, "it shall not be forgiven him, neither in this world, neither in the world to come;" or as in Luke, simply, "it shall not be forgiven."—Thus declaring that forgiveness should never be granted; (and 'never,' I suppose, means here what it commonly does, unless Benevolus can discover some new one for it;) and then the idea in the positive form, "but is in danger of eternal damnation," is exposed, obnoxious to it, as the man sentenced to death for murder is to the punishment of his crime. And I would ask, can any thing be more unequivocal than this; if so, what is it? That must be a desperate cause, that meets you in the fore front of the battle with such lameness as appears in the positions of Benevolus. Still, he wields his weapons with some degree of adroitness, as you will further see in his answer to my 3d query. In view of the passage cited, I inquired if eternal damnation will not be the portion of him that never receives forgiveness? Yes, replies Benevolus, "eternal damnation" *is* "the portion of him who" *never yet hath had* "forgiveness." But what does he mean? Does he mean to say, that all those will be eternally damned who had not been forgiven before the Saviour uttered these words, or all those that had not forgiveness when Benevolus wrote them, or that no man is forgiven until he is eternally damned? Whatever way, it seems equally childish. In charity to Benevolus; we must conclude, that the extraordinary turn which he has given to this passage, is owing to his not having looked at the parallel place in Matthew, where the future is used; "it *shall* not be forgiven him; neither in this world, neither in the next."—But for this oversight in Benevolus, his exposition must have appeared ridiculous, even to himself. Besides, the Saviour is not here speaking of a "damnation" that the sinner hath, but of something future, to which he is exposed as the consequence of committing the sin, respecting which, God has interdicted forgiveness; to which he is exposed as a penalty and punishment. And now, after all the puny attempts of Benevolus to undermine this passage, I see not but it reads just what it did before, and points to the same conclusions. In view of it, I now draw but one inference, which is this—that a case might occur in our world, in which God would never forgive the sinner; the consequence of which would be, that he never would be saved,—the loss of salvation is a possible thing among men. To shew it to be matter of fact, at present I refer only to the account of the general judgment, given in the 25th chapter of Matthew, and the 20th of Revelations.

Should Benevolus condescend to write again, I have only to say to him, that I wish him to have a sincere regard for the truth in God's word, just as it is; that cursed be he that taketh therefrom, or addeth thereto; it being said of such an one, "God shall take away his part out of the book of life, and out of the holy city, and out of the things which are written in this book;" that he can consider himself at best but a raw hand at exposition, and that he has given sufficient proofs of his temerity in such a business already.

TRUTH.

(To be continued.)

THE FIRST CHAPTER OF GENESIS.

The first chapter of Genesis may be considered as an exordium to the Bible. The sacred penman, in a single page, has, in bold allegory, related a variety of events, circumstances and transactions, which command the most consummate attention. To one scanty chapter has he confined the work of the creation. And yet, so fully has he accomplished every thing the grandeur of the subject demanded, that: curiosity is captivated, and the soul impressed by every sentence.

"In the beginning, God created the heavens and the earth—and the earth was without form, and void—darkness overshadowed the face of the deep; and the spirit of God moved upon the waters!"

The true sublime of language opens upon us in this passage. It is truth arrayed in the decorations of Oriental poetry. The earth was without form,—it was the reign of Chaos and of Nobit;—matter and motion were in the utmost disorder;—no distinction, no harmony, no regularity;—all those materials, which were presently commanded by the Almighty Architect, to compose the according system, were void!—

In this verse, as through a mirror, we see this delightful universe, in its state of anarchy: we look, as it were, into the regions of the past, and are struck with a view of things, even before the beginning. How wide—how incomprehensible—how infinite the confusion! a promiscuous assemblage of discordant stones, and all the materials of the riches—of a beauteous world, tumbled together without use or form. But, the thick gloom obstructs our view, and yet we behold, or *think* we behold, the mighty and immortal Spirit of the Deity himself, moving upon the waters.—The elements hear and obey;—the mighty work of wonders is begun; let such, therefore, as are able to

joy the awful scene exhibited in this verse. indulge their admiration, by proceeding to the next, which displays at once, omnipotence and benignity! *And God said let there be light and There was* LIGHT—There is no possibility of reading this without a tremor of veneration; there is no thinking upon it without astonishment. It is at once so amazing an instance of power and kindness, of tenderness and authority, that, the enraptured reader knows not which attribute most to reverence.

Indistinguishable darkness had sat brooding upon the face of the deep, previous to the command—Let there be light—and there was light—the word was issued by the Creator, and the order was obeyed in the same instant. But, what were the benevolent consequences of this command?—no less than the bringing into existence, a universe, with all the elegances—all the conveniences belonging to it;—the division of seasons, the establishment of the planets—and the general accommodation for the service of the favorite creature!

In the remaining verses of the chapter, the economy, the wisdom, and the bounty of providence are displayed in all the simplicity and purity of sacred literature. Where is the barren fancy that doth not kindle, as it proceeds, with the glorious subject!—Where is the heart that feels not the mercies which resulted from the orders of the original Parent of all!

The celestial, vivifying spirit no sooner began to move, than all things sprang into existence: the day for delight—the night for repose—the breath of the morning became embalmed—and the evening breezes bore healthful blessings on their youthful wings:—the waters became obedient, retiring to their bounds, and the earth smiled with variegated verdure:—animals of various species—some adapted to the wood—some to the wave—some exulting in their speed—others contented with their slowness—some trusting to the foot—others mounting upon the wing, sported over creation. Then, but not till then, was *man* created! The world being now fit for the reception of such an inhabitant, he was introduced upon the scene as master of the mighty drama—in the similitude of his Almighty Master, with the face of a cherub, the form of a God, he was born for dominion—authority sat on his brow, his eye denoted his power, & the Father put in his hand the sceptre of command!—Then arose woman—the loveliest of creation's works—the companion, the friend, the wife of his greatness. Thus was society founded upon the endearments of love and innocence, the lambs bleated forth their joy—the birds sang amidst the branches—man triumphed in his honors, and the Deity surveyed his work, and behold, it was very good!

Modern writers, sensible of the beauty of this admirable opening of the sacred books have viewed it as worthy their imitation, and, without any scruple, have adopted it as a pattern! and yet, neither moderns nor ancients, have equalled the brevity, the sublimity and perspicuity of Moses. It is needless to run into the catalogue of instances, the general defect is obvious!—The greatest Epic poets among the ancients, Homer and Virgil, have been complimented on the conciseness of their exordiums, but neither the Iliad, nor Euclid, possess the varied excellencies which are compressed, without being crowded, in the first chapter of Genesis!—*P. U. Magazine.*

THE HERALD OF SALVATION.

SATURDAY, APRIL 5, 1823.

For the Herald.

Continued from page 59.

The origin of the institution of the "Priests Office," with all nations, except the Jews; is enveloped in antiquity so remote, as to effectually veil it, from the present age. And even could we by the most laborious research, arrive at it in every nation; it is by no means certain that such investigation would result in knowledge, which would be essentially beneficial: For should its origin be traced to any other source, than *divine appointment*, however gratifying, as a matter of history, the information might be, it is plain that it could be useful, in no other point of light. It is therefore in the faithful history of the Jewish nation alone, that we are able to trace the original of this institution: the cause of its establishment; the great objects to be effected by it; the qualifications of those who were called to minister therein; together with the mode of induction into the office &c.

An understanding of these particulars, it is believed, will enable us, to improve our general subject in a way, both profitable and acceptable to the reader.

Assuming then, that the Mosaic history of this "peculiar," and "chosen," though bigoted, and ill fated nation, is *divinely authentic:* we will proceed to inquire.

1st. Into the *origin* of the institution of the "*Priests Office.*"

The word "Priest," occurs but *four* times, if we mistake not, in the book of Genesis. In the 18th v. of the 14th Ch.; it is applied to *Melchizedek*, King of Salem; (Peace,) who is called "Priest of the most high God;" and of whom nothing more is said in the old

Testament, except what occurs in the 110th Psalm, 4th v. where we read, "The Lord hath sworn, and will not repent, thou art a *Priest*, forever after the order of Melchizadek." Nothing appears from the use of the word, or the connection in which it stands in either of the above quotations—which would justify the supposition, that it was so used with reference to any particular *office*, then known; or that any particular duty was required of, or enjoined upon him, on whom the title was conferred; distinct from what was required of, and enjoined upon any other person. But even should the existence of the "Priests Office" at that time, be admitted, it would determine nothing as to the *authority* by which it was established.

Again. Gen. 41. 45, we read, that Pharaoh named Joseph; "And gave him to wife Asenath, the daughter of the *Priest* of On." Also, 47. 22. In this verse the word is twice used; and is applied to a class of people whose land was not sold to Pharaoh, during the distresses of the Israelites in Egypt.—They are called "Priests." In both of these chapters however, no one will deny, that the circumstances named in connection; together with the country and people in which, and with whom, Moses locates them, justify the marginal reading, as by far the most correct. Had the original word, here rendered *Priest*, received the translation usually given it in the Septuagint; and which the circumstances would seem peculiarly to justify; we might then have read *Prince* of the most high God; *Prince* of On; *Princes* of Israel; *Prince* of Midean &c. But whether we adopt the one reading or the other; or whatever meaning the phrase may with propriety receive; still nothing is determined in relation to the origin and establishment of the "Priests *Office*."

The first use of this phrase, in the bible, if we do not much mistake, is in the 1st v. of the 28th chapter of Exodus. In the 24th chapter, we have the account of God's calling Moses on to Mount Sinai; and the 7 following chapters contain "the Law" there given him, "written with the finger of God on the tables of stone," and by him communicated to the people. After a very particular and minute description of the sacrifices to be offered: the sanctuary; ark; mercy seat; table of shittimwood; Candlestick, and its appendages; tabernacle; altar; court of the Tabernacle &c. to be made; we read (ch. 28. v. 1,) "And take thou unto thee Aaron thy brother, and his sons with him, from among the children of Israel, that he may minister unto me in the *Priests Office*, even Aaron, Nadab, and Abihu, Eleazar, and Ithamar, Aaron's sons."

From this we learn that this institution, originated in the mandate of God to Moses; was established about 1490 years, (according to sacred Chronology) before the commencement of the Christian era; and while the children of Israel were on their journey from Egypt, to the land of their fathers.

JOHN.

(To be Continued)

Conversion of a Universalist.

Concluded from page 71.

It is mortifying to the pride of man to reflect that death levels all distinctions; that the baubles of religion, and the trappings of hypocrisy must share the fate of the other paltry distinctions of men; that the slave will in another world be undistinguished from his tyrant, and the lordly priest be no more esteemed than the poor wretch on whom he now volleys the curses of human systems, and denounces with the eternal hell of never ending damnation. What! shall all mankind be admitted to Heaven—will no distinction feed my vanity or inflate my pride! away with it, away with it! crucify it, crucify it! but I will never bow! Thus speaks the human heart when loaded with the putrifying sores of priestcraft and the leper scales of tyranny, while Universalism proclaims "the restitution of *all things* which God hath spoken by the mouth of all his *holy* prophets." Thus is it when the Pharisees of the day will "not submit to understand the Bible, as it actually reads," but will change "*all*" into *part*, "*every*" into some, and fabricate on the sand the building which upholds the pocket, viz. an *eternal* hell, which though they say man deserves, yet will they plant the foot against the throne of Deity, and in the face of omnipotence drag justice from its seat, by their prayers. O! Babylon, Babylon!

We have heard a preacher of respectability warn his hearers against trusting in "the vague and precarious hope of the mercy of God," and yet the Tract maker speaks of the convert throwing himself on the "unmerited compassion" so vague and precarious according to human creeds.

With these few remarks we dismiss the Tract, recommending our readers to examine it for themselves.

We shall, however, notice the anecdote annexed.

The anecdote informs us that "A clergyman belonging to Connecticut, not long since, being in a neighbouring state, fell in company" with a profane swearer, who excused himself by saying. "*I am a Universalist!*" "The excuse of this youth for his impious speeches, fully confirms one weighty

objection, which has been made made by orthodox people, against the scheme of universal salvation, i. e. that it opens an effectual door for licentiousness." I feel no hesitation in saying that this anecdote is false, and will continue to assert it until the name of the clergyman, the state, and young man with the date, &c. are given: but suppose it true, does it cause any objection to Universalism? If none but Universalists are profane swearers, if many Calvinists whose names, &c. can be given, are not such, as likewise persons of all sects, there might be something like reason in it; but unless all Universalists are swearers, and every swearer is a Universalist, we cannot agree that this crime is peculiar to that people. But if a disciple of any religion, by swearing, affords a weighty objection to that religion, what ground does Christianity stand on, for Peter swore?

The real state of the case is this: The Universalists, in their "Articles of Faith," which may be had at the Editor's, discountenance swearing, and go so far as to recommend to their people not to take an oath even in a court of justice; but let their "yea be yea, and their nay, nay;" whilst the Presbyterians, in their confession of Faith, encourage their people to swear, by saying, that "a lawful oath is a part of religious worship." Now a young man of this sect might with propriety apologise for swearing, by saying, "I am a Presbyterian!" And if this is not opening "an effectual door for licentiousness," what is it?

The anecdote continues—"It also affords a conclusive proof, that the sentiment originated from the old serpent who has the character in sacred writ, of being "a liar from the beginning," and who, preaching the same false & destructive doctrine to our first parents in Paradise, procured their apostacy: which has involved their numerous posterity in total depravity, guilt and wretchedness."

The Universalists preach that "as in Adam all die, even so in Christ shall all be made alive." Did the old serpent preach this? Did he say any thing about Christ? Or did he say as the Calvinists do to the elect, "Ye shall not surely die?" The writer, after describing the total depravity of men, (which by the by is as bad a state as man can suffer) says that "this grand deceiver knows, by long experience, that nothing further is requisite to effect the final and everlasting ruin of sinners, than to persuade them to settle down upon this fallacious belief, that "all men will be finally happy, whether they serve God or Mammon."

Here the grand secret is out; we are now told by those who know best, what doctrine was preached by him who was a "liar from the beginning." It is the same which is now thundered from the pulpit and the press, by those who make lies their refuge, and who preach what the "grand deceiver knows, by long experience," &c. This knowledge of theirs & the grand deceiver, wonderfully coincides,—alas! the former had not the cunning of his majesty, else they surely would not have exposed the cloven foot, and spoke of their union against the word of God! Instead therefore of seeking the knowledge of the devil, however long experienced, let us "acquaint ourselves with God, and be at peace; endeavour to know Jesus Christ and him crucified; to know that we have passed from death unto life, because we love the brethren; to know finally, that as all men die in Adam, without exception of saint or sinner, "so in CHRIST shall all be made alive," and let us be convinced that whenever we hear from the pulpit that believing "all men will be finally happy," is all that is requisite to effect the "final and everlasting ruin of sinners;"—I repeat, when we hear this, let us recollect that it is the doctrine of the grand deceiver, who knows it to be true by long experience, and whose attornies are pleading his cause.

LIBERTY.

REASON AND REVELATION.

Reason is natural Revelation, whereby the eternal Father of Light, and fountain of all knowledge, communicates to mankind that portion of truth which he has laid within the reach of their natural faculties. Revelation is natural reason enlarged by a new set of discoveries, communicated by God immediately, which reason vouches the truth of, by the testimonies and proofs it gives, that they come from God. So that he who takes away reason to make room for revelation, puts out the light of both; and does much the same, as if he would pursuade a man to put out his eyes, the better to receive the remote light of an invisible star by a telescope.—*Locke.*

Anecdote.

A flaming preacher once, after dooming nine tenths of his hearers to the shades of woe forever, asked, what could have a worse appearance than a sinner in heaven? An attentive hearer replied, "A sinner in a pulpit judging sinners out of the pulpit to endless misery."

POETRY.

SELECTED.

THE NATIVITY:

No war nor battle's sound
Was heard the world around;
No hostile chiefs to furious combat ran;
But peaceful was the night,
In which the Prince of light
His reign of peace upon the earth began.

The shepherds on the lawn,
Before the point of dawn,
In social circle sat; while all around
The gentle fleecy brood,
Or cropp'd the flow'ry food,
Or slept, or sported on the verdant ground.

When lo! with ravish'd ears,
Each swain delighted hears
Sweet music, offspring of no mortal hand
Divinely warbled voice,
Answ'ring the stringed noise,
With blissful rapture charm'd the list'ning band.

They saw a glorious light
Burst on their wond'ring sight,
Harping in solemn choir, in robes array'd,
The helmed cherubim,
And sworded seraphim,
Are seen in glitt'ring ranks, with wings displayed.

Sounds of so sweet a tone,
Before were never known,
But when of old the sons of morning sung
While God dispos'd in air
Each constellation fair,
And the well-balanc'd world on hinges hung.

Hail, hail, auspicious morn!
The Saviour Christ is born:
(Such was th' immortal seraph's song sublime.)
Glory to God in heav'n!
To man sweet peace be giv'n,
Sweet peace and friendship to the end of time!

[Milton, altered by Rev. Dr Gardiner.]

MARRIED.

In Pamelia, on the 23d ult. by the Rev. Pitt Morse, MR. JOSHUA C. HARLOW, of Sacket's Harbor, to MISS ANNA G. AUSTIN, of the former place.

OBITUARY.

DIED, in Henderson on the 22d ult. *Dorcas Bullard*, consort of Mr. Percival Bullard, in the 29th year of her age. She was an affectionate companion, a tender mother, a virtuous and valuable citizen.—Her complaint, being of the consumptive kind, subjected her to a lingering and distressing approach to the grave. With christian patience and humble resignation, she yielded to her fate. She had the inexpressible consolation of an unshaken faith in the impartial grace of God, and the final "restitution of all things." This cheered her in affliction, and filled her mind with "joy unspeakable and full of glory," even in the hour of death. She calmly selected a Hymn to be used at her funeral, from which the following is an extract.

"All creatures in heav'n and earth shall revere,
No blind superstition shall deafen the ear;
Jesus shall be crown'd the head of all men!
The peace of his kingdom shall ne'er have an end.
All sin shall be closed, transgression shall cease,
All nature be filled with love, joy and peace,
The victory won! rebellion shall fall!
And God, our Creator, shall be ALL in ALL!

In Henderson on the 26th ult Mrs. Tubbs, wife of Dr. N. Tubbs. A dutiful, kind and valuable companion, and an affectionate mother, her loss is most severely felt by her surviving family and friends. She was a worthy member of a Baptist Church. She bore her lingering affliction and distress with the fortitude and patience of the christian, and in humble resignation to the unerring wisdom and will of God, she yielded to death, in the confident hope of a blessed and glorious immortality.

In Champion, on the 24th ult. *Doct. Ebenezer Field*, formerly of Wintonbury, Hartford Co. Conn. in the 25th year of his age. In the morning of life, in the dawn of usefulness and respectability, he has fallen a prey to the "icy hand of Death!" He was a young man of amiable disposition, correct moral deportment and commanding talents. He had the respect and esteem of all his acquaintance. He bore a protracted and painful, consumptive complaint with christian fortitude and patience. During his sickness he received every alleviation of his misery, which care, skill and kindness could administer. In the certain prospect of speedy dissolution, his mind was calm and serene; his faith in the unlimited mercy of God, was unwavering; his trust was in "the living God who is the Saviour of all men."—The glorious *hope* of a happy immortality divested death of its victory and its terrors, and continued to be an anchor to his soul "both sure and steadfast."

In this town, on the 29th ult. *Mr. Jonah Woodruff*, aged 73 years.

PUBLISHED SEMI-MONTHLY, IN WATERTOWN, N. Y. AT $1 PER ANN. PAYABLE IN ADVANCE,

*****

S. A. ABBEY, PRINTER.